

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADAM JAY STONE,
Plaintiff,
v.
C. PFEIFFER, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-01461-ADA-SAB (PC)
ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION
(ECF No. 70)

Plaintiff Adam Jay Stone is proceeding pro se in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for clarification, filed January 9, 2023. Plaintiff contends that he never requested to conduct settlement negotiations and he never sought reconsideration of the Court's December 12, 2022, order. (ECF No. 70.) Rather, Plaintiff submits that he "is requesting the Court to clarify what is going on with his case in regards to this matter." (Id. at 1.) As stated in the Court's December 23, 2022, order, there is insufficient evidence to substantiate Plaintiff's allegations regarding the "eavesdropping" of officers during the settlement conference in this case. In addition, the Court must defer to prison officials regarding the safety and security of the prison. See Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 86 (1987) (the Supreme Court has long emphasized that absent substantial evidence to the contrary, courts should defer to prison officials' judgment regarding prison security and administration.); see also Wright v. Rushen, 642 F.2d 1129, 1132 (9th Cir. 1981) (courts should avoid enmeshing

1 themselves in minutiae of prison operations in the name of the Constitution). Moreover, there is
2 currently no settlement conference scheduled, and any order relating to such would be
3 premature. Again, Plaintiff is advised that the parties are free to engage in settlement
4 negotiations amongst themselves and may contact the Court if they both believe a settlement
5 conference would be beneficial.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: **January 11, 2023**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE